

## REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 9, 18, and 21 are independent. By the foregoing Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 9 and canceled claim 21. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter and their entry is respectfully requested.

### Rejection of Claim 21 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 3, 30-32, 36, and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. By the foregoing Amendment, Applicants have canceled claim 21 rendering the rejection of it moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and remove the rejection.

### Rejection of Claims 1-5, 9-13, and 18-20 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In paragraph 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 9-13, and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious by U.S. Patent No. 6,356,122 B2 to Sevalia et al. (hereinafter “Sevalia”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,636,249 to Roither (hereinafter “Roither”). To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, an Examiner must show three things: (1) that there is some suggestion or motivation to modify a reference or combine reference teachings to arrive at the claimed invention, (2) that there must be a reasonable expectation of success, and (3) that the references teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention (MPEP §2143). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Representative amended claim 1 recites in pertinent part “at least one ***driving circuit*** outputting an output signal onto an interconnect; at least one ***receiving circuit*** receiving an input signal from an interconnect; a ***phase locked loop*** receiving a reference clock signal and a delayed feedback clock signal, and ***supplying an output clock signal to*** said at least one ***driving circuit*** ***and*** said at least one ***receiving circuit***, said phase locked loop generating said output clock signal according to said received reference clock signal and delayed feedback clock signal” (emphasis added). Support for these changes can be found in Applicant’s Specification at page 8, second full paragraph, and in Figure 3.

Applicants respectfully submit that Sevalia in view of Roither fail to teach or fairly suggest each and every element recited in claim 1. For example, Sevalia in view of Roither fail to teach or fairly suggest using clock signals out of the clock generator to drive output circuits in a driving agent onto the bus. Similarly, Sevalia in view of Roither fail to teach or fairly suggest using clock signals out of a clock generator to drive input circuits in the receiving agent onto the bus.

Amended claim 1 also recites “first and second delay elements located in the path of said reference clock signal and the path of a feedback clock signal, respectively, said first and second *delay elements being configured to* provide a delay in order to make said output signal *meet a predetermined valid data timing requirement*” (emphasis added). Support for these changes can be found in original claim 1. Applicants’ Specification at page 10 describes how this is accomplished according to an embodiment of the present invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that Sevalia in view of Roither fails to teach or fairly suggest this element recited in claim 1. For example, Sevalia in view of Roither fails to teach or fairly suggest configuring delay lines to meet common clock timing requirements of a bus, such as setup and hold conditions.

Because Sevalia in view of Roither fails to teach each and every element of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over Sevalia in view of Roither. Amended independent claims 9 and 18 recite similar elements. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 9 and 18 are patentable over Sevalia in view of Roither as well.

Claims 2-5 properly depend from claim 1, claims 10-13 properly depend from claim 9, and claims 19-20 properly depend from claim 18, which applicants respectfully submit are patentable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-5, 10-13, and 19-20 are patentable as well. MPEP §2143.03 provides that if an independent claim is unobvious, then any claim depending from the independent claim is unobvious (citing *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir.1988)). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and remove the rejection to claims 1-5, 9-13, and 18-20.

#### Rejection of Claims 6 and 14 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In paragraph 20 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 6 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sevalia and Roither in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,818,270 to Hamza (hereinafter “Hamza”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 6 and 14 properly depend from claims 1 and 9, respectively, which Applicants respectfully submit are patentable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 6 and 14 are patentable for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 9 are patentable. (MPEP §2143.03 (citing *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988))). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and remove the rejection to claims 6 and 14.

#### Rejection of Claims 7-8 and 15 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In paragraph 25 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 7-8 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sevalia and Roither in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,977,837 to Byrn (hereinafter “Byrn”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 7-8 and 15 properly depend from claim 9, respectively, which Applicants respectfully submit is patentable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 7-8 and 15 are patentable for at least the same reasons that claim 9 is patentable. (MPEP §2143.03 (citing *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988))). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and remove the rejection to claims 7-8 and 15.

#### Rejection of Claims 16-17 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In paragraph 31 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sevalia and Roither as applied to claim 9 and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,742,798 to Goldrain (hereinafter “Goldrain”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 16-17 properly depend from claim 9, respectively, which Applicants respectfully submit is patentable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 16-17 are patentable for at least the same reasons that claim 9 is patentable. (MPEP §2143.03 (citing *In re*

*Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and remove the rejection to claims 16-17.

Rejection of Claim 21 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In paragraph 37 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sevalia and Roither in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,259,295 to Kriz (hereinafter "Kriz"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

By the foregoing Amendment, Applicants have canceled claim 21 rendering the rejection of it moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and remove the rejection to 21.

### CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that all grounds for rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot, and that the application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative if the Examiner believes that an interview might be useful for any reason.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date:

May 16, 2006

Jan Little-Washington  
Jan Little-Washington  
Reg. No. 41,181  
(206) 292-8600

### FIRST CLASS CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on

May 16, 2006

Date of Deposit

Yuko Tanaka

Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

U. Tanaka

Signature

May 16, 2006

Date